

PHOTO-BASED TRAFFIC ENFORCEMENT ATTITUDE STUDY

January 2007

Prepared for

City of Scottsdale
Scottsdale, Arizona

Prepared by

Behavior Research Center, Inc.
45 E. Monterey Way
Phoenix, Arizona 85012
(602) 258-4554



TABLE OF CONTENTS

	<u>Page</u>
INTRODUCTION	1
DETAILED FINDINGS	2
EFFECTS OF PHOTO ENFORCEMENT	2
EFFECT OF PHOTO ENFORCEMENT ON RESPONDENT BEHAVIOR	4
SUPPORT FOR PHOTO ENFORCEMENT	5
SHOULD THE STATE OR THE CITY ADMINISTER PHOTO ENFORCEMENT?	7
PERCEPTION OF THE FEELINGS OF OTHERS	8
AWARENESS OF SCOTTSDALE DEMONSTRATION PROJECT ON LOOP 101	9
EFFECT OF COLLISION STATISTICS ON PHOTO ENFORCEMENT SUPPORT	11
EFFECT OF SPEED ON COLLISIONS	12
SERIOUSNESS OF SPEEDING	13
SUPPORT FOR HOLDING THE VEHICLE OWNER RESPONSIBLE FOR CITATIONS	14

INTRODUCTION

This report was commissioned by the City of Scottsdale and conducted by Behavior Research Center (BRC). The purpose of the study was to measure attitudes about the use of photo-based traffic enforcement statewide, and follows a similar study conducted in March 2006.

The information contained in this report is based on 795 in-depth interviews with adult heads of household throughout Arizona and an additional 407 heads of household in Scottsdale. Interviewing was conducted in November and December 2006 by professional interviewers at BRC's state-of-the-art Computer-Assisted Telephone Interviewing (CATI) facility in Phoenix, where each interviewer worked under the direct supervision of BRC supervisory personnel. Interviews were conducted during a cross-section of late afternoon, evening and weekend hours to ensure that all households had a roughly equal opportunity of being called. A basic sample of 800 interviews were conducted statewide, proportionate to population in each region. In addition, because the City of Scottsdale wanted a specific understanding of how residents of Scottsdale feel about photo enforcement, an oversample of 407 interviews were conducted in Scottsdale. In this report, the data for overall (statewide) results were mathematically weighted to represent the entire state population distribution to ensure that the feelings of Scottsdale residents do not receive disproportionate weight.

Prior to beginning the interviewing, each interviewer received a thorough briefing on the particulars of the study. During the briefing, the interviewers were trained on (a) the purpose of the study, (b) sampling procedures, (c) administration of the questionnaire, (d) probing protocols for open-ended questions and (e) other project-related issues. In addition, each interviewer completed a series of practice interviews to ensure that all procedures were understood and followed.

When analyzing the results of this survey, it should be kept in mind that all surveys are subject to sampling error. Sampling error, simply stated, is the difference between the results obtained from a sample and those that would be obtained by surveying the entire population under consideration. The overall sampling error for this survey at a 95 percent confidence interval is approximately ± 3.5 percent and the sampling error for Scottsdale alone is approximately ± 5.0 percent.

Behavior Research Center has presented all of the data germane to the basic research objectives of the project. However, if City of Scottsdale management requires additional data retrieval or interpretation, we stand ready to provide such input.

BEHAVIOR RESEARCH CENTER

DETAILED FINDINGS

EFFECTS OF PHOTO ENFORCEMENT

Arizonans appear more certain now than they were earlier in the year that the use of photo enforcement technology has had a positive effect on overall traffic safety, cutting down speeding, reducing the number of collisions and even saving taxpayer dollars. In each case, those feeling photo enforcement has done “a great deal” has increased three percentage points since last March, and the percentage of those feeling the program has done “nothing at all” has dropped between two and four points.

TABLE 1

“As you may know, photo enforcement technology is now in use in several Arizona cities. If you have not heard about them, photo enforcement detection sites can be either fixed – that is, pole mounted – or mobile – vehicle mounted – systems. Depending on the technology used, the systems may use either radar or in-road electronic sensors to calculate speed. From what you know or may have heard, has this program done a great deal, some, only a little or nothing at all to. . .”

	A Great Deal	Some	Only a Little	Nothing at All	Not Sure
Improve overall traffic safety in cities where it is operating	26%	32%	16%	13%	13%
Cut down on speeding in cities where it is operating	29	32	15	11	13
Reduce the number of collisions	23	28	12	16	21
Save taxpayer dollars	15	22	13	26	24
~~~~~					

Table 2 displays the results to the question of the effect of photo enforcement on improving overall traffic safety by demographic groups. Most notable in this table is that Scottsdale residents – arguably those with the most experience with, and exposure to, photo enforcement – are overwhelmingly convinced this technology has had a positive effect on traffic safety, with almost half (46%) stating it has done “a great deal” to improve safety.

**TABLE 2 : IMPROVE TRAFFIC SAFETY – DETAIL**

*“As you may know, photo enforcement technology is now in use in several Arizona cities. If you have not heard about them, photo enforcement detection sites can be either fixed – that is, pole mounted – or mobile – vehicle mounted – systems. Depending on the technology used, the systems may use either radar or in-road electronic sensors to calculate speed. From what you know or may have heard, has this program done a great deal, some, only a little or nothing at all to...?”*

	A Great Deal	Some	Only a Little	Nothing at All	Not Sure
TOTAL	26%	32%	16%	13%	13%
<u>GENDER</u>					
Male	24	29	20	14	13
Female	28	34	13	12	13
<u>AGE</u>					
Less than 35	20	32	18	20	10
35 to 54	25	33	17	12	13
55 or over	35	30	13	8	14
<u>ETHNICITY</u>					
Caucasian	26	35	16	11	12
Hispanic	29	24	19	13	15
Other	28	19	15	24	14
<u>COUNTY</u>					
Maricopa	30	31	16	13	10
Pima	21	21	19	13	26
Rural	19	41	14	12	14
Scottsdale	46	28	11	9	6
~~~~~					

EFFECT OF PHOTO ENFORCEMENT ON RESPONDENT BEHAVIOR

Little changed from the March study, eight in ten (80%) Arizonans admit they are more careful to observe speed limits where photo enforcement is operating, and this percentage is remarkably consistent across demographic groups.

TABLE 3

"Would you say you would be more careful to observe speed limits when you are driving in cities that have photo enforcement operating?"

	<u>% Yes</u>
TOTAL	80%
<u>GENDER</u>	
Male	79
Female	81
<u>AGE</u>	
Less than 35	78
35 to 54	84
55 or over	78
<u>ETHNICITY</u>	
Caucasian	79
Hispanic	86
Other	84
<u>COUNTY</u>	
Maricopa	79
Pima	77
Rural	84
Scottsdale	84

~~~~~

## SUPPORT FOR PHOTO ENFORCEMENT

In another indication that the publicity surrounding Scottsdale's demonstration freeway photo enforcement project has had a positive effect on public opinion, we note in Table 4 that the net of support to opposition to the use of photo enforcement has grown by eleven points since March. Moreover, an increase in support can be seen in every demographic group – even among men and those under 35, the most negative demographics.

**TABLE 4**

*"In general, do you strongly support, support, oppose or strongly oppose the use of photo enforcement?"*

|                         | Strongly<br>Support | Support    | Oppose     | Strongly<br>Oppose | Not<br>Sure | Net –<br>Support/<br>Oppose |
|-------------------------|---------------------|------------|------------|--------------------|-------------|-----------------------------|
| <b>TOTAL</b>            | <b>28%</b>          | <b>45%</b> | <b>13%</b> | <b>8%</b>          | <b>6%</b>   | <b>+52</b>                  |
| <u><b>GENDER</b></u>    |                     |            |            |                    |             |                             |
| Male                    | 25                  | 40         | 18         | 11                 | 6           | <b>+36</b>                  |
| Female                  | 30                  | 50         | 9          | 5                  | 6           | <b>+66</b>                  |
| <u><b>AGE</b></u>       |                     |            |            |                    |             |                             |
| Less than 35            | 16                  | 51         | 17         | 11                 | 5           | <b>+39</b>                  |
| 35 to 54                | 28                  | 45         | 14         | 8                  | 5           | <b>+51</b>                  |
| 55 or over              | 39                  | 41         | 8          | 4                  | 8           | <b>+68</b>                  |
| <u><b>ETHNICITY</b></u> |                     |            |            |                    |             |                             |
| Caucasian               | 27                  | 46         | 13         | 8                  | 6           | <b>+52</b>                  |
| Hispanic                | 27                  | 49         | 15         | 4                  | 5           | <b>+57</b>                  |
| Other                   | 30                  | 40         | 15         | 11                 | 4           | <b>+44</b>                  |
| <u><b>COUNTY</b></u>    |                     |            |            |                    |             |                             |
| Maricopa                | 30                  | 43         | 14         | 8                  | 5           | <b>+51</b>                  |
| Pima                    | 15                  | 58         | 13         | 4                  | 10          | <b>+56</b>                  |
| Rural                   | 31                  | 42         | 11         | 9                  | 7           | <b>+53</b>                  |
| Scottsdale              | 39                  | 36         | 14         | 8                  | 3           | <b>+53</b>                  |
| ~~~~~                   |                     |            |            |                    |             |                             |

Table 5 shows that support for the use of photo enforcement *on freeways* is very strong among those who support the technology in general. Indeed, while 73 percent of the total support photo enforcement in general (Table 4), 62 percent overall support its use on freeways.

**TABLE 5**

*"Do you strongly support, support, oppose or strongly oppose the use of photo enforcement on freeways?"*

**AMONG THOSE WHO SUPPORT PHOTO ENFORCEMENT IN GENERAL**

(Percentages shown are of total respondents)

|                         | Strongly<br>Support | Support    | Oppose    | Strongly<br>Oppose | Not<br>Sure | <b>Total<br/>Support</b> |
|-------------------------|---------------------|------------|-----------|--------------------|-------------|--------------------------|
| <b>TOTAL</b>            | <b>28%</b>          | <b>34%</b> | <b>7%</b> | <b>2%</b>          | <b>2%</b>   | <b>62%</b>               |
| <u><b>GENDER</b></u>    |                     |            |           |                    |             |                          |
| Male                    | 26                  | 31         | 7         | 1                  | 1           | <b>57</b>                |
| Female                  | 30                  | 38         | 8         | 2                  | 2           | <b>68</b>                |
| <u><b>AGE</b></u>       |                     |            |           |                    |             |                          |
| Less than 35            | 19                  | 34         | 9         | 3                  | 3           | <b>53</b>                |
| 35 to 54                | 27                  | 35         | 9         | 2                  | 1           | <b>62</b>                |
| 55 or over              | 40                  | 34         | 4         | 1                  | 2           | <b>74</b>                |
| <u><b>ETHNICITY</b></u> |                     |            |           |                    |             |                          |
| Caucasian               | 28                  | 36         | 7         | 1                  | 2           | <b>64</b>                |
| Hispanic                | 26                  | 34         | 9         | 7                  | 0           | <b>60</b>                |
| Other                   | 30                  | 30         | 7         | 4                  | 0           | <b>60</b>                |
| <u><b>COUNTY</b></u>    |                     |            |           |                    |             |                          |
| Maricopa                | 28                  | 35         | 7         | 2                  | 1           | <b>63</b>                |
| Pima                    | 21                  | 41         | 7         | 2                  | 2           | <b>62</b>                |
| Rural                   | 30                  | 29         | 9         | 1                  | 2           | <b>59</b>                |
| Scottsdale              | 43                  | 27         | 3         | 1                  | 0           | <b>70</b>                |

Totals do not add to 100% due to photo enforcement opponents not being asked the question.

~~~~~


SHOULD THE STATE OR THE CITY ADMINISTER PHOTO ENFORCEMENT?

Respondents are generally divided on the question of whether freeway photo enforcement should be administered by the state or by the city through which the freeway runs.

TABLE 6

“Whether or not you support photo enforcement, when it is used on freeways, do you feel it should be administered by the State or by the city or county in which the freeway is located?”

	State	City/ County	Either/ Does Not Matter	Neither	Not Sure
TOTAL	45%	39%	7%	2%	7%
<u>GENDER</u>					
Male	48	36	8	3	5
Female	43	40	6	2	9
<u>AGE</u>					
Less than 35	43	48	3	2	4
35 to 54	45	36	8	2	9
55 or over	48	34	8	2	8
<u>ETHNICITY</u>					
Caucasian	45	38	7	2	8
Hispanic	48	45	5	0	2
Other	51	32	5	5	7
<u>COUNTY</u>					
Maricopa	44	37	7	3	9
Pima	49	35	10	1	5
Rural	46	45	3	2	4
Scottsdale	40	34	12	3	11

~~~~~

## PERCEPTION OF THE FEELINGS OF OTHERS

Even on the “reverse” question – where we ask respondents how they think other drivers feel about photo enforcement – we can see evidence that the media attention to the subject in the past several months has had a positive effect on public opinion. The percentage who believe most oppose it has fallen from 31 to 25 percent since March.

TABLE 7

*“And thinking about other drivers around the state, which of the following best describes how you think they feel about photo enforcement?”*

|                                                    |            |
|----------------------------------------------------|------------|
| Most everyone supports it                          | 3%         |
| A majority supports it                             | <u>17</u>  |
| <b>Net – support</b>                               | <b>20%</b> |
| Evenly divided between<br>supporters and opponents | 44         |
| A majority opposes it                              | 18         |
| Almost everyone opposes it                         | <u>7</u>   |
| <b>Net – oppose</b>                                | <b>25%</b> |
| Not sure                                           | 11         |

~~~~~

AWARENESS OF SCOTTSDALE DEMONSTRATION PROJECT ON LOOP 101

Two-thirds (66%) statewide were aware of the Scottsdale demonstration project on a portion of the Loop 101 before our interviewer mentioned it. This reinforces the evidence that this project has resulted in greater public awareness of the issue.

TABLE 8

"As you may know, the City of Scottsdale recently conducted a demonstration photo enforcement program on a section of the Loop 101. Before I just mentioned it, were you aware of this demonstration program?"

	<u>% Yes</u>
TOTAL	66%
<u>GENDER</u>	
Male	68
Female	63
<u>AGE</u>	
Less than 35	64
35 to 54	65
55 or over	68
<u>ETHNICITY</u>	
Caucasian	68
Hispanic	63
Other	52
<u>COUNTY</u>	
Maricopa	77
Pima	33
Rural	58
Scottsdale	89

~~~~~

The effect of the Scottsdale demonstration project on public support for photo enforcement may be found in Table 9, where we note that the project caused over four in ten (43%) to become more supportive, while making only 15 percent less supportive. The project had its maximum positive impact on Scottsdale (59%) and other Maricopa County (46%) residents.

TABLE 9

*"Did that program make you more supportive of photo enforcement on freeways, less supportive, or did it make no difference to you?"*

|                  | More<br>Supportive | No<br>Difference | Less<br>Supportive | Not<br>Sure |
|------------------|--------------------|------------------|--------------------|-------------|
| TOTAL            | 43%                | 41%              | 15%                | 1%          |
| <u>GENDER</u>    |                    |                  |                    |             |
| Male             | 40                 | 40               | 19                 | 1           |
| Female           | 45                 | 42               | 12                 | 1           |
| <u>AGE</u>       |                    |                  |                    |             |
| Less than 35     | 24                 | 49               | 27                 | 0           |
| 35 to 54         | 40                 | 44               | 15                 | 1           |
| 55 or over       | 64                 | 31               | 3                  | 2           |
| <u>ETHNICITY</u> |                    |                  |                    |             |
| Caucasian        | 43                 | 41               | 15                 | 1           |
| Hispanic         | 45                 | 43               | 12                 | 0           |
| Other            | 37                 | 41               | 20                 | 2           |
| <u>COUNTY</u>    |                    |                  |                    |             |
| Maricopa         | 46                 | 39               | 14                 | 1           |
| Pima             | 25                 | 60               | 15                 | 0           |
| Rural            | 38                 | 42               | 18                 | 2           |
| Scottsdale       | 59                 | 26               | 14                 | 1           |

~~~~~

EFFECT OF COLLISION STATISTICS ON PHOTO ENFORCEMENT SUPPORT

Knowing that the number of collisions drop by 20 percent when photo enforcement is in place makes almost two-thirds (63%) more supportive of the technology. This argument is most influential among women and older residents.

TABLE 10

“Studies show that where photo enforcement is in use, the number of collisions drops 20 percent. Does this make you more favorable toward photo enforcement, less favorable, or does it make no difference?”

	More Favorable	No Difference	Less Favorable	Not Sure	Net - More/Less Favorable
TOTAL	63%	29%	5%	3%	+58
<u>GENDER</u>					
Male	57	34	6	3	+51
Female	69	25	3	3	+66
<u>AGE</u>					
Less than 35	57	34	6	3	+51
35 to 54	62	30	6	2	+56
55 or over	75	22	1	2	+74
<u>ETHNICITY</u>					
Caucasian	65	28	4	3	+61
Hispanic	56	35	8	1	+48
Other	62	31	1	6	+61
<u>COUNTY</u>					
Maricopa	60	31	5	4	+55
Pima	60	32	7	1	+53
Rural	73	23	2	2	+71
Scottsdale	72	22	4	2	+68
~~~~~					

## EFFECT OF SPEED ON COLLISIONS

Virtually identical results, in terms of support for photo enforcement, may be found when respondents are told that 35 percent of collisions are due to speed.

**TABLE 11**

*"Statistics also show that 35 percent of collisions are due to speeding. Does this fact make you more favorable toward photo enforcement, less favorable, or does it make no difference?"*

	More Favorable	No Difference	Less Favorable	Not Sure	Net - More/Less Favorable
<b>TOTAL</b>	62%	32%	4%	2%	<b>+58</b>
<u><b>GENDER</b></u>					
Male	53	41	5	1	<b>+48</b>
Female	70	25	2	3	<b>+68</b>
<u><b>AGE</b></u>					
Less than 35	53	42	5	*	<b>+48</b>
35 to 54	63	33	3	1	<b>+60</b>
55 or over	74	21	2	3	<b>+72</b>
<u><b>ETHNICITY</b></u>					
Caucasian	63	33	3	1	<b>+60</b>
Hispanic	62	34	2	2	<b>+60</b>
Other	63	30	4	3	<b>+59</b>
<u><b>COUNTY</b></u>					
Maricopa	61	32	4	3	<b>+57</b>
Pima	56	43	1	*	<b>+55</b>
Rural	70	25	4	1	<b>+66</b>
Scottsdale	72	23	4	1	<b>+68</b>

*Indicates less than 1/2 of one percent

~~~~~

SERIOUSNESS OF SPEEDING

Next, we asked respondents whether they think speeding is a problem on freeways, on surface streets, in residential areas, in construction and school zones. Two-thirds or more feel speeding is a serious problem in each.

TABLE 12

"Would you say that speeding is a very serious problem, a somewhat serious problem, not a very serious problem or not a problem at all on each of the following:"

| | Freeways | Major
Surface
Streets | Residential
Areas | Construction
Zones | School
Zones |
|----------------------------|------------|-----------------------------|----------------------|-----------------------|-----------------|
| Very serious | 49% | 47% | 46% | 42% | 45% |
| Somewhat serious | <u>32</u> | <u>33</u> | <u>30</u> | <u>27</u> | <u>22</u> |
| Net – Serious | 81% | 80% | 76% | 69% | 67% |
| Not very serious | 10 | 13 | 14 | 15 | 15 |
| Not a problem at all | <u>7</u> | <u>5</u> | <u>8</u> | <u>11</u> | <u>14</u> |
| Net – Not a problem | 17% | 18% | 21% | 26% | 29% |
| Unsure | 2 | 2 | 2 | 5 | 4 |
| ~~~~~ | | | | | |

SUPPORT FOR HOLDING THE VEHICLE OWNER RESPONSIBLE FOR CITATIONS

Finally, we asked respondents whether they would support holding the vehicle owner responsible for a citation issued through photo enforcement, knowing that many offenders avoid responsibility because the vehicle owner refuses to identify the driver. Six in ten (58%) support such a measure. As may be seen in Table 13, strongest levels of support are found among women, residents over 55, Hispanics and Pima County residents.

TABLE 13

"As you may know, current Arizona law provides that the driver of a vehicle cited for speeding through photo enforcement is charged with the offense, which results in many offenders avoiding responsibility because the vehicle's owner will not identify the driver. In some states, unless the owner identifies the driver, the vehicle owner is responsible for the citation. In general, do you strongly favor, favor, oppose or strongly oppose holding vehicle owners responsible unless they identify the driver?"

| | Strongly
Favor | Favor | Oppose | Strongly
Oppose | Not
Sure | Net -
Favor/
Oppose |
|-------------------------|-------------------|-------|--------|--------------------|-------------|---------------------------|
| TOTAL | 30% | 28% | 22% | 15% | 5% | +21 |
| <u>GENDER</u> | | | | | | |
| Male | 28 | 28 | 24 | 17 | 3 | +15 |
| Female | 32 | 28 | 20 | 13 | 7 | +27 |
| <u>AGE</u> | | | | | | |
| Less than 35 | 21 | 37 | 20 | 15 | 7 | +23 |
| 35 to 54 | 30 | 26 | 23 | 18 | 3 | +15 |
| 55 or over | 41 | 23 | 22 | 8 | 6 | +34 |
| <u>ETHNICITY</u> | | | | | | |
| Caucasian | 28 | 29 | 23 | 15 | 5 | +19 |
| Hispanic | 38 | 27 | 17 | 11 | 7 | +37 |
| Other | 38 | 22 | 20 | 15 | 5 | +25 |
| <u>COUNTY</u> | | | | | | |
| Maricopa | 28 | 26 | 22 | 17 | 7 | +15 |
| Pima | 26 | 43 | 20 | 9 | 2 | +40 |
| Rural | 38 | 23 | 25 | 11 | 3 | +25 |
| Scottsdale | 30 | 23 | 21 | 21 | 5 | +11 |

\*Indicates less than 1/2 of one percent

~~~~~